

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. The applicants request reconsideration of the rejection based on the following remarks.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by *Anderson, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5, 809,129). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In rejecting independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that all of the elements are disclosed by *Anderson*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, the Office Action appears to assert that the claimed "first resource request monitor, adapted to monitor at least one resource request transmitted by a communications unit of said network, said resource request including information representing a respective amount of communication resources of said communications network being requested, said first resource monitor being further adapted to provide first information representing said amount of resources requested by said resource request." corresponds to the call layer shown in Fig. 1 of *Anderson* and described in column 1, lines 31-37. Careful analysis of this teaching in *Anderson*, however, reveals that the claimed elements are not in any way taught or suggested by Fig. 1 or the referenced sections of the patent. *Anderson* is not concerned with and contains no teaching concerning mentoring of resources requested, but rather resource allocation. Requesting the use of an individual bearer service for connection establishment by a service network in a call layer as described in *Anderson* is not qualities to a "first resource request monitor, adapted to monitor at least one resource request transmitted by a communications unit" as featured in claim 1. Moreover, no where does *Anderson* teach or suggest that requests for connection to an individual bearer service include a "resource request including information representing a respective amount of communication resources of said communications network being requested."

Further, the Office Action appears to assert that the claimed "second resource request monitor, adapted to monitor an amount of communications resources being provided to said communications unit in response to said resource request, and to

provide second information representing said amount of said communications resources being requested by said resource request” is disclosed in Fig. 1 of *Anderson* and, in particular, the second service network, SN2. This correlation is somewhat unclear, however, because the claimed “first resource request monitor” was correlated to the “call layer” shown in Fig. 1, whereas the claimed “second resource request monitor” is correlated to a service network SN2, which is a part of the “call layer” and accordingly it is unclear from the Office Action how elements which are part of the call layer are correlated to the claimed “second resource request monitor” and the over-arching call layer itself is correlated to the “first resource request monitor”. Such correlations are illogical. More salient, is the fact that the second service network SN2 of *Anderson* is not taught or suggested to “monitor an amount of communications resources being provided to said communications unit in response to said resource request, and to provide second information representing said amount of said communication resources being requested by said resource request.” The second service network SN2, just the same as any of the service networks in the call layer shown in Fig. 1 of *Anderson*, are taught to merely send connection requests, not the amount of communications resources being requested.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that the claimed “coordination center, adapted to compare said first and second information to determine whether said amount of communications resources provided, as represented by said second information, equals said amount of communications resources requested, as represented by said first information” is somehow not also in the teachings of *Anderson* concerning the second service network SN2 shown in Fig. 1. The rejection, however, does not clearly set forth what elements of Fig. 1 of *Anderson* actually meet this claimed element. Moreover, *Anderson* fails to teach or suggest such an element. Because *Anderson* does not teach or suggest provisions of information representing amounts of resources requested by first and second resource request monitors, a coordination center would not be taught or even needed to compare such first and second information. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing comments, the applicants submit that claim 1 is not taught or suggested by *Anderson*.

With respect to claims 2-7 and 9, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, these claims are allowable on their merits and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

With respect to independent method claim 11, the applicant submits that the elements of this claim are not taught or suggested by *Anderson* for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent apparatus claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 12-17 and 19 are allowable for the same reasons as they ultimately depend from claim 11.

Claims 8, 10, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S. S. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson* and further in view of *Christie* (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,928). The applicant traverses this rejection and submits that these claims are patentable over the combination of *Anderson* and *Christie* for the reasons presented above with respect to independent claims 1 and 11.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Craig Plastrik
Reg. No. 41,254

Dated: 6 July 2004

THE DIRECTV GROUP, INC.
(formerly Hughes Electronics Corporation)
Customer No. 20991